

Application No. 10/715,367
H-7187

EXHIBIT A

Interview Summary of October 21, 2009

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/715,367

Applicant(s)

KAGEHIRO ET AL.

Examiner

ANDRAE S. ALLISON

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ANDRAE S. ALLISON.

(3) Shrinath Malur (Reg: 34663).

(2) Anand Bhatnagar (Primary Examiner).

(4) Masako Kawakami and Hiroto Nagayoshi.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: n/a.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Background of Specification and Pidsy.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Andrae S Allison/

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant Representative gave a brief overview of the invention specifically pointing out the novelty of the invention and the differences between the claim 1 and the cited prior art. Applicant Representative argued that these features are not found in the references cited, specifically in the cited area of the Background of the Specification. The Examiner agrees and informed Applicant to respond to the outstanding office action and the Examiner will do an updated search and consider the substance of this interview before responding.